

Application Number:	22/01168/HOUS
Location:	450 Heywood Old Road Middleton M24 4SB
Proposal:	Front porch extension and application of white render to side and rear elevations - Retrospective
Applicant:	USMAN AFZAL
Case Officer:	Bob Melling
Recommendation:	Grant subject to conditions

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N
	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

This application relates to no.450 Heywood Old Road, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in the Bowlee area of Middleton. The dwelling faces northwest towards the highway, adjoining no.452 to the northeast and is adjacent to no.448 to the southwest. The rear of the dwelling backs onto playing fields.

The property forms part of a small hamlet consisting of 10 dwellings surrounded by Protected Open Land, as defined in the Proposals Map of the Rochdale UDP. All properties along this section of Heywood Old Road are constructed with brick, with no.454 featuring render to the side and single storey rear elevations.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective permission is sought for the render finish to the side and rear walls and for the front porch extension that has a projection of 1.33m and a width of 2.36m. The porch has a dual-pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.58m and a ridge height of 3.31m.

Relevant History

18/00663/HOUS - Two storey and single storey side and rear extension; conversion of existing integral garage to bathroom; creation of bay windows at first and ground floor level of existing side extension; erection of front canopy at ground floor level; and dropped kerb to front of driveway.

Granted Subject to Conditions – 23/08/2018
20/00526/AM - Section 73 to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 18/00663/HOUS to allow alterations from hipped roof to gable and enlargement of front porch.

Refuse – 13/08/2020

Township/Member comments

None.

Consultee responses

Not applicable.

Representations

Not applicable.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

D/10 Protected Open Land

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P3 Improving Design of New Development
DM1 General Development Requirements
T2 Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

The plans were revised during discussions to remove the render from the front elevation.

Assessment

Principle of Development - Protected Open Land

The application site is allocated as Open Protected Land under saved Policy D/10 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (2006). Policy D/10 is therefore relevant to any applications on the site and in the supporting text to this policy it is established that development proposals will be permitted that fall within several categories

including development which would be acceptable were it in the Green Belt. Furthermore, Core Strategy policy G5 seeks to protect open land outside the urban area and not in the green belt.

Part 2(a) of policy G5 states that: "Development on open land outside the urban area and not in the green belt will be resisted unless: it is limited development that would be acceptable were it in the green belt." Therefore, the application will be considered against guidance relating to development in the Green Belt to determine whether it would constitute acceptable development.

Paragraph 147 of the NPPF establishes that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 that continues in stating that Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 149 of the NPPF establishes that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. There are however listed exceptions to this which are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; [officer's emphasis]**
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed scheme would constitute inappropriate development were it within the Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.

Given that the front porch extension has a volume of 7.71m³, it is not considered to result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would meet the exception requirements of sub-section (c).

Whilst the scale of the proposal falls within the exception under paragraph 149c and very special circumstances are not required to be demonstrated, paragraph 148 requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt by reference to any inappropriateness and any other harm. Later sections of this report consider any other harm that exists through the proposals.

Design/Amenity: DM1 and P3

Policy DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy requires *“development to be of high quality design taking opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.”* Policy P3 of the Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016 states that all new development must *“enhance the borough’s identity and sense of place, by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general.”*

Additionally, paragraph 134 of the NPPF states:

“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes”.

Paragraph 5.1 of the SPD states that all new developments *“should be designed to be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.”*

The proposed front porch extension is considered acceptable as the front facing gable would not be an alien form in the street scene and, on balance, would be of acceptable proportions as to preserve the character and appearance of the street scene and existing dwelling.

The proposal also seeks to apply white render to the side and rear elevations. Although the majority of neighbouring dwellings are constructed in brick. In this instance, it is considered that the use of render would not unduly increase the prominence of the development from surrounding public vantage points.

The porch will not result in any loss of privacy or amenity to neighbouring occupiers.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Grant subject to the following conditions

1. The permission relates to the following plans:
 - Proposed Elevations. Drg no. 22.2867.4A. Issue A
 - Existing And Proposed Block Plan. Drg no. 22.2876.3

- As Built Elevations. Drg no. 22.2867.2
- As Built Floor Plans. Drg no. 22.2867.1
- Location Plan

And the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

Reason: for the avoidance of doubt, and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	18/10/2022	Signed: BM
Authorisation	08/11/2022	Signed: AT

Report Author Bob Melling